REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The non-final Office Action of October 25, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-4 and 7 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-7 remain pending upon entry of this amendment. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, and 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0220078 to Luken ("Luken"), in view of RFC 3525: Gateway Control Protocol Version 1 ("RFC 3525") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,089,211 to Trostle *et al.* ("Trostle"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, providing each of a Media Gateway and a Media Gateway Controller with an initial key to validate digital signatures and each of the Media Gateway and said Media Gateway Controller generating a shared key having a specific lifetime when the Media Gateway registers with the Media Gateway Controller by using the initial key. Nowhere do any of the cited references, either separately or in combination, teach or suggest such features. For example, none of the cited references teaches or suggests providing each of a Media Gateway (MG) and a Media Gateway Controller (MGC) with an initial key to validate digital signatures and subsequently generating a shared key when the MG registers with the MGC. While Section 10.3 of RFC 3525 describes a protocol allowing a Media Gateway Controller to provide a Media Gateway with session keys that can be used to encrypt audio messages, RFC 3525 lacks a teaching or suggestion of the provision of an initial key for validating digital signatures to each of the MGC and the MG *and* a shared key for authenticating messages between the MGC and the MG. In fact, RFC 3525 is entirely silent on how digital signatures are validated. The Office Action alleges that Luken discloses that a MGC can be used to verify digital signatures in paragraph [0064]. Even assuming, without conceding, the validity of such an assertion, Luken still does not teach or suggest an initial key, provided to *both* the MGC and the MG for validating digital signatures. Trostle does not cure the above identified deficiencies. Thus, notwithstanding whether Luken, RFC 3525 and Trostle are properly

combinable, the asserted combination would not have resulted in the features as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Dependent claims 3 and 5-7, which each depend from claim 1, are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luken, RFC 3525 and Trostle and further in view of Cryptography and Network Security by William Stallings ("Stallings"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Notwithstanding whether any combination of Luken, RFC 3525, Trostle, and Stallings is proper, Stallings fails to cure the above noted deficiencies of Luken and Wheeler with respect to claim 1. At most, Stallings discloses a key distribution scenario in which user A issues a request to a key distribution center (KDC) for a key and the KDC responds with a session key. pp. 214-215. Even so, Stallings does not teach or suggest providing an initial key to each of an MGC and a MG for validating digital signatures. In fact, the Office Action does not cite to Stallings for any of the features recited in claims 1-7. Regardless, any proposed combination of the applied references would not result in the features as recited in independent claim 1. Claims 2 and 4, which depend from claim 1, are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and further in view of the additional advantageous features recited therein.

For example, claim 2 recites, *inter alia*, an initial digital signature generated by the Media Gateway using said initial key, wherein the initial key is provided to both the MGC and the MG (per claim 2's dependency on claim 1). At best, Luken describes generating a digital signature using a *private* digital key of a control unit. para. [0064]. Nowhere does Luken teach or suggest that the private digital key used to generate the digital signature is an initial key provided to both an MGC and an MG. The cited secondary references fail to cure this deficiency of Luken. Accordingly, claim 2 is allowable for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: January 25, 2008   By: _____/Chunhsi Andy Mu/_____

Chunhsi Andy Mu
Registration No. 58,216

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001